



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,949	01/17/2006	Diego Anza Hormigo	P1942US	4094
8568 7590 09/12/2011 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP ATTN: PATENT DOCKET DEPT. 191 N. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 3700 CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
HUYNH, NAM TRUNG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/12/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBRIPDocket@db.com

IPDockets@db.com

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/564,949	ANZA HORMIGO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	NAM HUYNH	2617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) NAM HUYNH. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) MARK BERGNER. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 August 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☒112 ☐102 ☒103 ☐Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_.

#### Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Discussed 112 issues with Applicant. An agreement was made that the claim language was indefinite. Worked with Applicant to draft potential amendments to overcome indefiniteness. Did not receive response from Applicant after acceptable claim language was agreed upon.

**Applicant recodation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recodation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment